

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 are pending in this application, Claims 1, 2, 5, and 15 having been currently amended. Support for amended Claims 1, 2, 5, and 15 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Moteki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,645; hereinafter “Moteki”).

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Moteki, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied reference.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus configured to display at least a map relating to navigation, and video content from a plurality of sources, including, *inter alia*:

...a display configured

to switch, when displaying said map, the display of said map to a display of video content, when a source operator for switching said sources is operated;

to sequentially and cyclically switch, when displaying said video content, between playback target sources of said plurality of sources, when said source operator is operated;

to switch, when displaying said video content, the display of said video content to the display of said map, when a map operator for instructing displaying of said map is operated; and

to switch, when displaying said map, the display of said map to the display of said video content, when said map operator is operated,

wherein a first display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said map and a second

display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said video content, and

the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at a lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at the upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively; and

a setting unit configured to set one of a plurality of sizes of a region for displaying said map or one of a plurality of sizes of a region for displaying said video content in a dual screen display, and to accept a size from said plurality of sizes of the region for displaying said video content for each of said sources,

wherein the display is configured to form said dual screen display based on a setting corresponding to each source.

Independent Claim 12 recites substantially similar features as Claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented below with respect to independent Claim 1 are also applicable to independent Claim 12.

Figure 1 of Moteki shows a device including a car navigation system including a display panel 11 which displays two screens 11a and 11b. However, Applicants respectfully submits that Moteki fails to teach or suggest that “the first display bar and the second display bar are ***displayed at a lower edge and an upper edge of the display***, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar ***are displayed at the upper edge and the lower edge of the display***, respectively,” as recited in Claim 1.

Moteki describes that the display panel 11 can alternate between a single-screen display mode and a dual-screen display mode.¹ Moteki also describes that in the dual-screen mode, the screen 11a can display video content and the display area 11b can display navigation information. However, as seen in Figure 6B of Moteki, a first display bar is not displayed which includes information about a map, and a second display bar is not displayed on the display that includes information about video content. Thus, Moteki also does not

¹ See column 10, lines 1-20 of Moteki.

describe that the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at a lower and an upper edge of the display. Hence, Moteki fails to teach or suggest that “the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at a lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at the upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively,” as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 12 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguish over Moteki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Moteki be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,944